

REMARKS

Applicants would like to thank Examiner Phu for the indication of allowance of claims 54, 56 and 58. Applicants also would like to thank Examiner Phu for the indication of allowable subject matter recited in claims 3, 14-16, 22, 33 and 44.

Claims 1-58 are pending in the action, with claims 1, 12, 20, 31, 42 and 53-58 being independent. Claims 1, 12, 20, 31 and 42 are amended to incorporate the allowable subject matter recited in claims 3, 14, 22, 33 and 44, respectively. Claims 3, 14, 22, 33, 44, 53, 55 and 57 are canceled, without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter recited therein. Claims 59-61 are added. Support for these new claims can be found, for example, in paragraphs [0034] and [0035]. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1-2, 4, 12-13, 17-21, 23, 31-32, 34, 42-43, 45, 53, 55 and 57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,597,732 to **Dowling**.

Claims 5, 24, 35 and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over **Dowling** in view of USP No. 6,452,967 to **Druihe**.

Claims 6-11, 25-30, 36-41 and 47-52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over **Dowling** in view of USP No. 6,775,529 to **Roo**.

Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections. Reconsideration and allowance of the above-referenced application are respectfully requested in light of the foregoing amendments and the following comments and remarks.

Section 102(e) Rejections

Claims 1-2, 4, 12-13, 17-21, 23, 31-32, 34, 42-43, 45, 53, 55 and 57 are rejected as allegedly being anticipated over **Dowling**. Applicants have respectively amended claims 1, 12, 20, 31 and 42 to incorporate the allowable subject matter recited in claims 3, 14, 22, 33 and 44. For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that amended claims 1, 12, 20, 31 and 42 are allowable.

Claims 2 and 4 depend from claim 1, and also are submitted to be allowable for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1.

Claims 13 and 17-19 depend from claim 12 and also are submitted to be allowable for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 12.

Claims 21 and 23 depend from claim 20 and also are submitted to be allowable for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 20.

Claims 32 and 34 depend from claim 31 and also are submitted to be allowable for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 31.

Claims 43 and 45 depend from claim 42 and also are submitted to be allowable for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 42.

Claims 53, 55 and 57 are canceled, rendering the rejection thereto moot.

New claim 59

New claim 59 recites in part a receiver to receive an analog communication signal, the analog communication signal containing a plurality of interference signals with at least one interference signal being generated by a non-local signal source. Dowling's alleged receiver 230 does not receive a plurality of interference signals, at least one interference signal being generated by a non-local signal source. Rather, Dowling's alleged receiver 230 only receives a single interference signal (echo signal 227). *See*, Fig. 2C.

New claim 59 also recites in part a combiner to combine each digital replica to generate a combined digital replica. Dowling's compensation circuit 240 only provides a single digital replica "Y" so that a combiner is not necessary.

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that Dowling does not anticipate new claim 59.

New claim 60

New claim 60 recites in part receiving means for receiving an analog communication signal, the analog communication signal containing a plurality of interference signals with at least one interference signal being generated by a non-local signal source, and combining means

for combining the digital replica of each interference signal to generate a combined digital replica.

However, as discussed above with respect to claim 59, Dowling does not teach or suggest these features. For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that Dowling does not anticipate new claim 60.

New claim 61

New claim 61 recites in part a transceiver operable to receive an analog communication signal containing a plurality of interference signals with at least one interference signal being generated by a non-local signal source, the transceiver including a combiner to combine the digital replica of each interference signal to generate a combined digital replica.

However, as discussed above with respect to claim 59, Dowling does not teach or suggest these features. For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that Dowling does not anticipate new claim 61.

Section 103(a) Rejections

Claims 5, 24, 35 and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over **Dowling** in view of **Druihe**.

Claim 5 depends from claim 1, and also is submitted to be allowable for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1.

Claim 24 depends from claim 20, and also is submitted to be allowable for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 20.

Claim 35 depends from claim 31, and also is submitted to be allowable for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 31.

Claim 46 depends from claim 42, and also is submitted to be allowable for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 42.

Section 103(a) Rejections

Claims 6-11, 25-30, 36-41 and 47-52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over **Dowling** in view of **Roo**.

Claims 6-11 depend from claim 1, and also are submitted to be allowable for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1.

Claims 25-30 depend from claim 20, and also are submitted to be allowable for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 20.

Claims 36-41 depend from claim 31, and also are submitted to be allowable for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 31

Claims 47-52 depend from claim 42, and also are submitted to be allowable for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 42.

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully request that all pending claims be allowed.

By responding in the foregoing remarks only to particular positions taken by the Examiner, Applicants do not acquiesce with other positions that have not been explicitly addressed. In addition, Applicants' arguments for the patentability of a claim should not be understood as implying that no other reasons for the patentability of that claim exist.

For all of the reasons set forth above, it is urged that the application is in condition for allowance, an indication of which is respectfully solicited.

If there are any outstanding issues that might be resolved by an interview or an Examiner's amendment, the Examiner is requested to call Applicants' representative at the telephone number shown below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 06-1050 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 21, 2008

/Alex Chan/

Alex Chan

Reg. No. 52,713

Customer No.: 26200

Fish & Richardson P.C.

Telephone: (650) 839-5070

Facsimile: (650) 839-5071